

REMARKS

The present communication is responsive to the Official Action dated January 9, 2006. A two-month extension of the time to respond, up to and including, June 9, 2006, is filed concurrently herewith.

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 12 and 14-18 remain pending in the application. Of these claims, claims 1, 6, 12 and 15 are independent. All the other claims pending in the application depend from one of the independent claims.

Claim 6 has been amended to now recite "identifying a first entity based upon the modified product information." Claim 6 has also been further amended to improve its form. Support for the amendments to claim 6 may be found by reference to, for example, paragraph [0041] of the written description. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that no new matter is added to the application as a result of the amendments to claim 6.

Claim 7 has been amended to improve its form in view of the amendments to claim 6.

Claims 19 and 20 are presented for the first time and capture a feature of applicants' invention described, for example, at paragraph [0040] of the written description. Accordingly, no new matter is added to the application as a result of the inclusion of these new claims.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 6, 12 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,321,236 to Zollinger, et al. ("Zollinger"). Using the language of claim 1, the Examiner asserts that *Zollinger* discloses "setting on or more update values indicating whether the first entity is authorized to receive changes relating to the first or second characteristic values associated with the first or second codes [profile database 56, Fig 1, col 8, lines 15-30, col 12, lines 15-30, col 4, lines 30-45]." (Official

Action 3.) The Examiner also asserted that *Zollinger* discloses "retrieving the identity of the first entity based on the changed characteristic value [differenceing engine 30, Fig. 1, col 6, lines 60-67]." (*Id.*)

Zollinger discloses a system and method for distributing changes made to a database or information stored on a server or main computer 68 to one or more client systems or users 48. (*Zollinger* Col. 1, 11.13-23.) In *Zollinger's* system, information is stored in tables. (*Id.*, See FIG. 1 and its description.) In particular, the server 68 includes a current table 20 which is continuously accessed and updated by other programs 22. (*Id.*, Col. 6, 11.46-53.) Thus, the current table 20 changes continuously. (*Id.*, 11.51-53.) A reference table 28 is maintained to track the changes to current table 20. (*Id.*, 11.54-59.) A version identifier 26 associated with the reference table 28 is used to track changes to current table 20. (*Id.*)

A differencing engine 30 takes as input the current table 20 and the reference table 28 and outputs the differences between these two tables as well as a version identifier 42. (*Id.*, Col. 6, 1.60 - Col. 7, 1.3.) Thus, the differencing engine 30 only determines the differences between the current information and the reference information, specifically the current and reference table, and passes such information to block 38 for storage. In that regard, applicants respectfully submit that the engine 30 is not disclosed as "retrieving the identity of the first entity based on the changed characteristic values," as asserted by the Examiner. Instead, the difference engine 30 is only disclosed as retrieving all the information in two tables 20, 28 and computing differences between the information stored in those two tables. Thus, whatever information *Zollinger* may retrieve, such retrieval is not disclosed or suggested as being based on "the changed characteristic value." The difference engine 30 simply does

base its retrieval on any type of changed values or information. In addition, *Zollinger* does not teach or suggest that the difference engine 30 retrieves the "identity of the first entity" or any entity, client or user for that matter. Rather, as discussed below, synchronization component 46 interfaces with clients 48 and accesses the profile database 56. But even synchronization component 46 is not disclosed as determining access based on "changed characteristic values."

Thus, applicants respectfully submit that *Zollinger* does not anticipate claims 1 and 15 as they recite "retrieving the identity of the first entity based on the changed characteristic value." Claim 6 is also not anticipated as it recites "identifying a first entity based upon the modified product information." Claim 12 is also not anticipated as it recites "means for retrieving the identity of the first vendor based on the changed characteristic value." Applicants also respectfully submit that the other references of record do not make for this deficiency in *Zollinger*. Therefore, these claims cannot be rendered obvious by the references of record, either individually or when combined.

Further with regard to *Zollinger*, the reference further discloses that when a client 48 connects to the server 68, the client identifies itself to the server synchronization component 46. (*Id.*, Col. 8, 11.6-13.) The server synchronization component 46 thereafter accesses a profile database 56 "in order to validate the clients" as part of a security feature, thereby assuring that a client is valid and can receive or request updated information. (*Id.*, 11.14-16; Col. 12, 11.15-30.) If the synchronization component 46 authenticates the client 48, it then "determine[s] which database tables are applicable to the client making the request" based on the profile database 56. (*Id.*, Col. 12, 31-33.) As noted by the Examiner, the profile database 56 "contains

information on each client authorized to received updates from the server synchronization component 46 including . . . a list of database tables authorized for update by the client; the version number for each authorized database table." (*Id.*, Col. 8, 11.15-27.) Zollinger, however, does not disclose "one or more distinct update values indicating whether the first entity is authorized to receive changes relating to the first or second characteristics values" associated with a product code. This is clearly the case because Zollinger first determines whether a user is authorized to receive any information as part of the synchronization request. (*Id.*, Col. 12, 11.21-23.) The synchronization request process is not disclosed as being based on "distinct update values."

In addition, even though the profile database 56 may be accessed as part of the synchronization process, that database is not disclosed as including "distinct update values" as is recited in the claims. Rather, as best understood, it is organized by client and in relevant part contains "a list of database tables authorized to be updated by the client" and the version for each such authorized table. However, this is not what's claimed.

In particular, claims 1 recites "one or more distinct update values indicating whether the first entity is authorized to receive changes relating to the first or second characteristic values associated with the first or second code."

Further in that regard, claim 6 recites "a distinct update value that indicates whether the first entity should be sent the modified information." Claim 12 recites "setting one or more distinct update values that provide an indication of whether the first vendor is authorized to automatically receive changes to the first or second characteristic values." Claim 15 recites "one or more distinct update values indicating whether the first entity is authorized to automatically receive updates

to a characteristic associated with a code." Applicants respectfully submit that this feature of claims 1, 6, 12 and 15 is not at disclosed by *Zollinger*. Rather, it is only after *Zollinger* authenticates a user as part of separate synchronization process that the profile database 56 is accessed to determine what the information the client may receive. Further in that regard, the profile database does not disclose or suggest storing or maintaining "distinct update values" as claimed.

Applicants also respectfully submit that the other references of record in the application do not make up for this deficiency in *Zollinger*. As such, those references cannot be combined with *Zollinger* to render claims 1, 6, 12 or 15 of the present application obvious for at least the foregoing reasons. As all the other claims depend from one these claims, the other claims are also not anticipated or rendered obvious for at least the foregoing reasons.

Lastly, applicants respectfully submit the "Boolean value" feature of claims 19 and 20 is clearly not suggested by any of the references of record.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

Application No.: 09/805,534

Docket No.: SONY 3.0-026

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: June 9, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Orville R. Cockings

Registration No.: 42,424

LEARNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

665465_1.DOC